



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,816	09/22/2008	Kirsten Povel	06088	6264
23338	7590	01/11/2012	EXAMINER	
DENNISON, SCHULTZ & MACDONALD			KUNDU, SUJOY K	
1727 KING STREET				
SUITE 105			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			2857	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/11/2012	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/585,816	POVEL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	SUJOY KUNDU	2857	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2011.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 5) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
  - 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Shimada et al. (Melanin and blood concentrations in a human skin model studied by multiple regression analysis: assessment by Monte Carlo simulation") in view of Cane et al. (US Patent No. 7,054,674)

With regards to Claim 1, Shimada teaches a method for determining the color effect, wherein the remission of the multilayer system is calculated by means of forward Monte Carlo simulation of intrinsic optical parameters dispersion coefficient  $\mu_s$ , anisotropy factor  $g$  and absorption coefficient of the different materials, calculated by inverse Monte Carlo simulation, taking into consideration refractive index  $n$ , thickness  $d$  of the respective layer of the materials as well as dispersion phase function of the individual materials and the color effect determined from the remission, characterized in that the intrinsic parameters dispersion coefficient  $\mu_s$ , anisotropy factor  $g$  and absorption coefficient of each of the materials are first calculated on the basis of a layer thickness of material enabling transmission of light and that a corrected absorption coefficient  $\mu_{ak}$  is then calculated by inverse Monte Carlo simulation on the basis of the

remission of the respective material of an optically dense layer having a thickness  $d_D$ , the corrected absorption coefficient  $\mu_{ak}$  as the absorption coefficient forming the basis for calculating the remission and the color effect of the multilayer system (Page 2397, Abstract, Page 2398-2399, Section 2.2 Monte Carlo simulation and inverse Monte Carlo simulation, (Figure 1, 3, 4).

Shimada is silent with regards to determining the color effect of a series of layers in teeth or dental materials and wherein the intrinsic optical parameters are determined on the basis of spectrometric measurements.

Cane teaches wherein the intrinsic optical parameters are determined on the basis of spectrometric measurements (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include wherein the intrinsic optical parameters are determined on the basis of spectrometric measurements as taught by Cane into Shimada for the purpose of accurately measuring the color effect.

Shimada and Cane are silent with regards to a series of layers in teeth or dental materials. However, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art to apply the Monte Carlo simulations of Shimada, which primarily are concerned with Melanin and blood concentration in human skin to that of the layers in teeth.

With regards to Claim 2, Shimada teaches the method which characterized in that the intrinsic optical parameters are determined on the basis of spectrometric measurements (Page 2397, Abstract).

With regards to Claim 3, Shimada teaches the method characterized in that the intrinsic optical parameters are taken from a data bank (Page 2397, Abstract).

**Note:** Because there are a multitude of complex calculations, it would be inherent that these parameters would be stored in a memory.

With regards to Claim 4, Shimada teaches the method characterized in that the intrinsic optical parameters dispersion coefficient  $\mu_s$ , uncorrected absorption coefficient  $\mu_a$  and anisotropy factor  $g$  of a material are calculated on the basis of macroscopic optical parameters of the material in the form of diffuse remission  $R_d$  as well as diffuse transmission  $T_d$  and/or total transmission  $T_t$  and/or collimated transmission  $T_c$ , taking into consideration the dispersion phase function of the material, thickness  $d$  of a layer of the material used during determination of the macroscopic parameters and refractive index  $n$  of the material by means of inverse Monte Carlo simulation (Page 2397, Abstract, Page 2398-2399, Section 2.2 Monte Carlo simulation and inverse Monte Carlo simulation, (Figure 1, 3, 4)).

With regards to Claim 5, Shimada teaches the method characterized in that the remission of the layer system is calculated for the series of layers consisting of different materials on the basis of the corrected absorption coefficient  $\mu_{ak}$ , the dispersion coefficient  $\mu_s$  and the anisotropy factor  $g$  of each material, taking into consideration at least the dispersion phase function, the refractive index  $n$  and thickness  $d$  of each layer and series of layers by means of forward Monte Carlo simulation (Page 2397, Abstract, Page 2398-2399, Section 2.2 Monte Carlo simulation and inverse Monte Carlo simulation, (Figure 1, 3, 4)).

With regards to Claim 6, Shimada teaches the method characterized in that, when calculating the intrinsic optical parameters by means of the inverse Monte Carlo simulation, measurement parameters and/or measurement geometries from the experimental determination of the macroscopic optical parameters are taken into consideration (Page 2397, Abstract, Page 2398-2399, Section 2.2 Monte Carlo simulation and inverse Monte Carlo simulation, (Figure 1, 3, 4).

With regards to Claim 7, Shimada teaches the method characterized in that the calculation of the color effect from the remission takes place by means of algorithms or multifactor analysis (Page 2397, Abstract, “regression”).

With regards to Claim 8, Shimada teaches the method characterized in that the color effect is calculated taking the geometric extension such as curvature of the layer system into consideration (Figures 1 and 2).

With regards to Claim 9, Shimada teaches the method characterized in that, when using an Ulbricht sphere-type spectrometer as measurement geometry, test geometry, diaphragm diameter, sphere parameter, beam divergence or diameter of a light spot are used as a basis (Page 2397, Abstract).

**Note:** This feature seems to be inherent.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUJOY KUNDU whose telephone number is (571)272-8586. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Schechter can be reached on 571-272-2302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sujoy K Kundu/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2857  
January 9, 2012